

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-10, 14-16, 20-31, 35-41, 68-75, 79-81 and 93 will remain pending in this application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 68-75 and 79-81 are allowable over the art of record.

Claims 42-67, 76-78 and 82-92 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

New Claim 93 has been added in this amendment.

Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skrovan (6,203,413), and further in view of Sun et al. (6,299,741).

The invention recited in claim 1, as amended, includes limitations previously set forth in claim 11, now cancelled, and similar limitations from claims 8, 9, 12 and 13, now amended. Accordingly, the amendments to claim 1 are properly characterized as including previously recited subject matter, and as such claim 1 should not be considered to have been amended for reasons relating to patentability.

As set forth, the invention of claim 1 recites removing conductive particles from the workpiece surface influencing device using a potential difference that exists between an electrode and a conditioning member. Thus, electrochemical removal of the conductive particles is described.

Skrovan teaches mechanical removal of particles from a pad using a conditioning member, but does not teach or suggest the use of a potential difference between an electrode and a conditioning member to remove conductive particles from its pad. The Examiner refers to column 5, lines 1-22 of Skrovan for this teaching, but in fact this section only teaches retarding corrosion of the components of the conditioning member, not reducing the size or number of conductive particles from a workpiece surface influencing device with a potential difference during electrochemical processing of the conductive particles. Sun does not make up for this deficiency, as Sun also does not teach or suggest reducing the size or number of conductive

particles from a workpiece surface influencing device with a potential difference during electrochemical processing of the conductive particles.

The dependent claims also contain allowable subject matter, including claims 3, 5, 6, 7, and 21-24 which recite that the step of operating includes a chemical mechanical deposition step that applies a conductive material to the workpiece surface, claims 8 and 9, 12 and 13, and 33 and 34, which respectively recite manners in which the conductive particles are formed on the workpiece surface influencing device, claims 27-29, which recite removal of conductive particles from the channels of the workpiece surface conditioning device, and claims 14-16 and 35-41 which recite simultaneous removal of particles using both electrochemical processing and mechanical removal.

In view of the foregoing and because all objections and rejections have been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
David A. Jakupin, Reg. No. 32,995

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP  
1600 Tysons Blvd.  
McLean, VA 22012  
650-233-4790; 650-233-4545 (fax)

60349029